



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,232	03/31/2004	Sankaran Narayanan	14917.1097US01	9746
27488	7590	10/14/2008		
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 2903			AHMED, SALMAN	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/14/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/815,232

**Applicant(s)**

NARAYANAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

SALMAN AHMED

**Art Unit**

2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/15/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-24 and 26-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 15, 34 and 35 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, 20, 26-30, 32 and 36-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 12-14, 16-19, 21-24, 31 and 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-846)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-2, 4-24 and 26-41 are pending.

Claim 7, 15, 34 and 35 are allowed.

Claims 9, 12-14, 16-19, 21-24, 31 and 33 are objected to.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, 20, 26-30, 32 and 36-41 are rejected.

Claims 3 and 25 are cancelled.

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 20, as amended is objected to because of the following informalities:  
Claim 20 refers to "third signature" without referring to "second" signature. It is unclear as to why claim limitation jumps from "a signature" in claim 1 to "third signature" in claim 20 without referring to "second" signature. Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claims 21-24 has similar issues.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 26-30, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Buch et al. (US PAT PUB 2003/0217165, hereinafter Buch).

Regarding claim 26, Buch teaches computer readable storage medium having computer executable instructions (see paragraphs 16 and 17) for performing steps for

processing messages in a pool of servers (see paragraph 24 and 25 caller and callee server) having a first server and a second server which are constructed and arranged to be interchangeably used to process messages in the same dialog (see figure 2 and paragraph 24 and 25 caller and callee server inherently constructed and arranged to be interchangeably used to process messages in the same dialog), the steps comprising: identifying, at the first server (see paragraph 25), a public key (see paragraph 26) and a private key (see paragraph 27); receiving, at the first server, a first message including a first header (see paragraph 28 receive message and paragraph 34); generating a session key (see paragraph 28 private-public key); encrypting the session key with the private key (see paragraph 28); generating, with the public key, a key signature (see paragraph 28 private- public key) based on the encrypted session key (see paragraph 27-28); inserting the key signature into the first header (see paragraph 34 and 42).

Regarding claim 27, Buch teaches further comprising: identifying, at the second server (see paragraph 25), the public key and the private key (see paragraph 28 private-public key); receiving, at the second server, a second message including a second header, the second header comprising the key signature (see paragraph 28); decrypting the key signature to determine the session key (see paragraph 28).

Regarding claim 28, Buch teaches further comprising: verifying at least a portion of the second message with the session key (see paragraphs 44, 45).

Regarding claim 29, Buch teaches the first message is a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) message (see paragraph 23).

Regarding claim 30, Buch teaches the first server is a proxy server (see paragraph 25).

In regards to claim 40, Buch teaches a method performed by a SIP node routing a SIP message between a first SIP node and a second SIP node (paragraph 0024, By way of example, FIG. 2 shows an exemplary session initiation operation in which a user 76 (e.g., "Ann") of a SIP client 72 wants to initiate a communication session with another user 80 (e.g., "Bob"). To that end, the SIP client 72 sends an INVITE request message 82 that identifies Bob as the intended recipient for the INVITE request), the method comprising: receiving the SIP message from the first SIP node (paragraph 0024, By way of example, FIG. 2 shows an exemplary session initiation operation in which a user 76 (e.g., "Ann") of a SIP client 72 wants to initiate a communication session with another user 80 (e.g., "Bob"). To that end, the SIP client 72 sends an INVITE request message 82 that identifies Bob as the intended recipient for the INVITE request), the SIP message including a first SIP routing header added to the SIP message by the first SIP node, the first SIP routing header identifying the first SIP node (see figure 2, From field and paragraph 0024, By way of example, FIG. 2 shows an exemplary session initiation operation in which a user 76 (e.g., "Ann") of a SIP client 72 wants to initiate a communication session with another user 80 (e.g., "Bob"). To that end, the SIP client 72 sends an INVITE request message 82 that identifies Bob as the intended recipient for the INVITE request); generating a digital signature of the first SIP routing header; adding the digital signature to the SIP message; and forwarding the SIP message to the second SIP node (paragraphs 0026-0030).

In regards to claim 41, Buch teaches adding, by the SIP node, a second SIP routing header comprising information identifying the SIP node (paragraph 0024, By way of example, FIG. 2 shows an exemplary session initiation operation in which a user 76 (e.g., "Ann") of a SIP client 72 wants to initiate a communication session with another user 80 (e.g., "Bob"). To that end, the SIP client 72 sends an INVITE request message 82 that identifies Bob as the intended recipient for the INVITE request), wherein the adding the digital signature comprises appending the digital signature to the second SIP routing header (paragraphs 0026-0030, 0034 and 0044).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buch et al. (US2003/0217165, hereinafter Buch) in view of Shores et al. (US PAT 7142537, hereinafter Shores).

Regarding claim 1, Buch discloses a method of processing a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) message comprising: receiving a SIP request (see paragraph 24 invite request message) at a SIP node (see paragraph 24 SIP client user/eg., "Ann"), the SIP request including a message header (see paragraph 0024, an INVITE request message 82 that identifies Bob as the intended recipient for the INVITE request paragraph 34, header of the SIP request 82, and paragraph 0036, 0041 header); generating a signature based upon at least a portion of the message header (see paragraphs 0038-0040); (c) generating a SIP node header entry (see paragraphs 0038-0040); and (d) inserting the signature into the SIP node header entry (see paragraphs 0038-0040).

Buch does not explicitly teach message header indicating data indicative of network routing locations; editing the data at the SIP node and generating header based upon at least a portion of the message header including the edited data.

Shores in the same field of endeavor teaches message header indicating data indicative of network routing locations (figure 2, elements 45 and 47); editing the data at the SIP node and generating header based upon at least a portion of the message header including the edited data (figure 2 and 6, column 6 lines 40-47, the From header 84 is extended by field 85 which is a user id field. The user id field 85 is the same field as the user id field 46 of From header 45 and is explained above with reference to FIG. 2. Similarly, the To header 86 is extended by field 87 which is a user id field. The user

id field 86 is the same field as the user id field 48 of To header 47 and is explained above with reference to FIG. 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch's system and method the steps of message header indicating data indicative of network routing locations; editing the data at the SIP node and generating header based upon at least a portion of the message header including the edited data as suggested by Shores. The motivation is that (as suggested by Shores, column 1 lines 23-27) such method of editing and extending protocol standardized messages, enables networks of a peculiar variety or an older type and are not suitable for using the IETF standards protocol, to reliably, securely and seamlessly communicate with one another.

Regarding claim 2, Buch teaches the SIP node header entry is an echoed header (see paragraphs 23 and 37 response message).

Regarding claim 4, Buch does not explicitly teach SIP node header entry being VIA header.

Shores in the same field of endeavor teaches SIP node header entry being VIA header (Figure 2, 4 and 5-10, VIA header).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch's system and method the steps of SIP node header entry being VIA header as suggested by Shores. The motivation is that, the VIA header field value typically includes a branch parameter; the branch parameter which is unique



across space and time for calls initiated by a client device, is used to reliably and efficiently identify the call created by a client device.

Regarding claim 5, Buch teaches receiving a SIP response at the SIP node in reply to the SIP request (see paragraph 23), a first received signature; and verifying the first received signature (see paragraphs 23 and 26).

Buch does not explicitly teach SIP response being VIA header.

Shores in the same field of endeavor teaches SIP node header for request/response being VIA header (Figure 2, 4 and 5-10, VIA header).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch's system and method the steps of SIP node header entry being VIA header as suggested by Shores. The motivation is that, the VIA header field value typically includes a branch parameter; the branch parameter which is unique across space and time for calls initiated by a client device, is used to reliably and efficiently identify the call created by a client device.

Regarding claim 6, Buch teaches verifying includes generating a verification signature (see paragraphs 23 and 26), the SIP response and comparing the verification signature with the first received signature (see paragraph 28).

Buch does not explicitly teach SIP response being VIA header.

Shores in the same field of endeavor teaches SIP node header for request/response being VIA header (Figure 2, 4 and 5-10, VIA header).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch's system and method the steps of SIP node header

entry being VIA header as suggested by Shores. The motivation is that, the VIA header field value typically includes a branch parameter; the branch parameter which is unique across space and time for calls initiated by a client device, is used to reliably and efficiently identify the call created by a client device.

Regarding claim 8, Buch teaches generating the signature includes generating a first signature based upon at least one portion of the message header (see paragraphs 23 and 26).

Buch does not explicitly teach header portion being VIA header.

Shores in the same field of endeavor teaches header portion being VIA header (Figure 2, 4 and 5-10, VIA header).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch's system and method the steps of SIP node header entry being VIA header as suggested by Shores. The motivation is that, the VIA header field value typically includes a branch parameter; the branch parameter which is unique across space and time for calls initiated by a client device, is used to reliably and efficiently identify the call created by a client device.

4. Claims 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buch and Shores as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Donovan (US PAT 6434143).

In regards to claim 11, Buch teaches generating second signature based upon at least a portion of header fields (paragraph 0044).

Buch and Shores do not explicitly teach RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT are fields which are part of the header.

Donovan in the same field of endeavor teaches RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT are fields which are part of the header (Tables in columns 5-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch and Shores's system and method of generating second signature based upon at least a portion of header fields with the steps of fields being RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT as suggested by Donovan. The motivation is that any arbitrary fields can be used to generate signature based on design choice and network requirement and RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT are such two fields that can be used to reliably and securely generate signature. Known work (i.e. generating second signature based upon at least a portion of header fields) in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it (i.e. fields being RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT) for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives (i.e. design choice and network requirement) or other market forces/market place incentives if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In regards to claim 20, Buch teaches determining fields of header of SIP request and generating signature includes generating third signature based upon at least a portion of the fields in header of SIP request (paragraph 0044).

Buch and Shores do not explicitly teach RECORD-ROUTE is a field which is part of the header.

Donovan in the same field of endeavor teaches RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT are fields which are part of the header (Tables in columns 5-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch and Shores's system and method of determining fields of header of SIP request and generating signature includes generating third signature based upon at least a portion of the fields in header of SIP request with the steps of field being RECORD-ROUTE as suggested by Donovan. The motivation is that any arbitrary fields can be used to generate signature based on design choice and network requirement and RECORD-ROUTE is such field that can be used to reliably and securely generate signature. Known work (i.e. generating second signature based upon at least a portion of header fields) in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it (i.e. field being RECORD-ROUTE) for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives (i.e. design choice and network requirement) or other market forces/market place incentives if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buch and Shores as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Tsuzuki et al., hereinafter Tsuzuki, (US2004/0246991).

In regards to claim 10, Buch teaches generating the first signature includes generating the first signature based upon the header of the SIP node as described above.

Buch and Shore does not explicitly teach a message header includes a plurality of VIA headers and plurality of VIA headers except the VIA header of the SIP node.

Tsuzuki in the same field of endeavor teaches a message header includes a plurality of VIA headers and plurality of VIA headers except the VIA header of the SIP node (see figure 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch and Shore's system and method the steps of a message header includes a plurality of VIA headers and plurality of VIA headers except the VIA header of the SIP node as suggested by Tsuzuki. The motivation is that, the VIA headers field value typically includes a branch parameter; the branch parameter which is unique across space and time for calls initiated by a client device, is used to reliably and efficiently identify the call created by a client device. Known work in one field of endeavor (i.e. VIA headers field value) may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives (used to reliably and efficiently identify the call created by a client device) or other market forces/market place incentives if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

6. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buch et al. (US2003/0217165, hereinafter Buch) in view of Bobde et al. (US PAT PUB 2003/0005280, hereinafter Bobde).

Regarding claim 37, Buch teaches a method of verifying a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) message, the method comprising: (a) receiving a SIP response at a SIP

node from another SIP node, the SIP response including a message header (see paragraph 24 and 36); (b) identifying an echoed header in the message header (see paragraph 24 generate a response to request, and it is inherent for a response message to include a header); (c) extracting a received signature from the echoed header (see paragraph 26); (d) generating a verification signature based upon at least a portion of the message header (see paragraph 28); (e) comparing the verification signature with the received signature (see paragraph 28).

Buch does not explicitly teach routing the SIP message to a next SIP node when the verification signature matches the received signature.

Bobde in the same field of endeavor teaches routing the SIP message to a next SIP node when the verification signature matches the received signature (paragraph 0028 and 0109).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch's system and method the steps of routing the SIP message to a next SIP node when the verification signature matches the received signature as suggested by Bobde. The motivation is that by authenticating prior to forwarding SIP messages enables a network to keep the communication safe and secure. Known work in one field of endeavor (i.e. authenticating prior to forwarding) may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives (keeping the communication safe and secure) or other market forces/market place incentives if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

7. Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buch and Bobde as applied to claim 37 above and further in view of Tsuzuki.

Regarding claims 38 and 39, Buch teaches: (claim 38) the echoed header (see paragraph 24 generate a response to a SIP request) and (claim 39) generating a verification signature includes generating the verification signature (see paragraph 28) and disclose all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of: (claim 38) is selected from the group consisting of a VIA header, a FROM header, a TO header, a RECORD-ROUTE header, a CALL-ID header, and a CSeq header and (claim 39) based upon at least a portion of at least one of a VIA header, a CONTACT header, a RECORD-ROUTE header a ROUTE header, a CALL-ID header, and a CSeq header.

Tsuzuki from the same or similar fields of endeavor teaches the use of the URI and the port number of the originating-side terminal 5A are designated by the VIA header indicative of a message path (see Tsuzuki paragraph 104), and more than one VIA headers (see Tsuzuki figure 21), To header, From header, Call ID, and CSeq (see Tsuzuki paragraph 104 and figure 15), via headers (see Tsuzuki figure 14 as correspond to claim 10) the URI and the port number of the originating-side terminal, and destination ID (see Tsuzuki paragraph 104 as correspond to RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT), and URI portion in the invite packet (see Tsuzuki figure 14 as correspond to claim 13).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the VIA headers as taught by Tsuzuki in the end-to-end

authentication of session initiation protocol messages using certificates of Buch in order to prevent request looping and ensure replies take the same path as the requests. Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces/market place incentives if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

8. Claims 32 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buch in view of Donovan (US PAT 6434143).

Regarding claims 32 and 36, Buch teaches computer readable medium having stored thereon a data structure (see paragraphs 16 and 17) representing a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) request (see paragraph 23), the data structure comprising: a plurality of SIP headers (see paragraph 39 headers) comprising an echoed header (see paragraph 23 and 37 response message) including an address of a SIP node in a route for the SIP request (see paragraph 24 and 34) and data representing a digital signature generated by signing a portion of the SIP headers with a session key (see paragraph 26), wherein the echoed header, is one of a group consisting of various fields of the header, wherein the data representing the digital signature is appended to one of the SIP headers (paragraphs 0042-0044).

Buch does not explicitly teach fields in header being one of a group consisting of a VIA header, a FROM header, a TO header, a RECORD-ROUTE header, a CALL-ID header, and a CSeq header,



Donovan in the same field of endeavor teaches a VIA header, a FROM header, a TO header, a RECORD-ROUTE header, a CALL-ID header, and a CSeq header are fields which are part of the header (Tables in columns 5-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch and Shores's system and method of the data representing the digital signature is appended to one of the SIP headers with the steps of fields being a VIA header, a FROM header, a TO header, a RECORD-ROUTE header, a CALL-ID header, and a CSeq header as suggested by Donovan. The motivation is that any arbitrary fields can be used to append signature based on design choice and network requirement and the data representing the digital signature is appended to one of a VIA header, a FROM header, a TO header, a RECORD-ROUTE header, a CALL-ID header, and a CSeq header of the SIP headers are such fields that can be used to reliably and securely append signature. Known work (i.e. the data representing the digital signature is appended to one of the SIP headers) in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it (i.e. fields being one of a VIA header, a FROM header, a TO header, a RECORD-ROUTE header, a CALL-ID header, and a CSeq header) for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives (i.e. design choice and network requirement) or other market forces/market place incentives if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In regards to claim 36, Buch teaches first and second signatures being generated based on portions of various fields in the header of SIP header (paragraphs 0042-0044).

Buch does not explicitly teach fields in header being RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT.

Donovan in the same field of endeavor teaches RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT are fields which are part of the header (Tables in columns 5-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate in Buch and Shores's system and method of first and second signatures being generated based on portions of various fields in the header of SIP header with the steps of fields being RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT as suggested by Donovan. The motivation is that any arbitrary fields can be used to generate signature based on design choice and network requirement and the data representing the digital signature is generated from the RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT of SIP headers are such fields that can be used to reliably and securely generate signature. Known work (i.e. first and second signatures being generated based on portions of various fields in the header of SIP header) in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it (i.e. fields being RECORD-ROUTE and CONTACT) for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives (i.e. design choice and network requirement) or other market forces/market place incentives if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claim 7, 15, 34, 35, is allowed.

10. Claims 9, 12, 13, 14, 16-19, 21-24, 31 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments see pages 13-19 of the Remarks section, filed 7/15/2008, with respect to the objection to the specification have been fully considered.

Claim 1:

Applicant's amendment necessitated a new ground of rejection presented in this office action. As such any further response to Applicant's argument is moot.

Claim 26:

Applicant argues that Buch fails to teach "generating a session key; encrypting the session key with private key; generating with the public key, a key signature based on the encrypted session key".

However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's assertion. Buch does indeed teach the cited limitations. Specifically, Buch teaches in paragraphs 0027-0028, the sender may encrypt the message with a (generated) session key, encrypt the session key with a public key (generated) of the intended recipient, sign the encrypted session key with her own private key, and include the session key in the SIP packet. When the callee SIP client 86 receives the SIP request message 82 containing the signature 100, it uses a certificate 102 of the sender associated with the private-public key pair of the sender to verify the digital signature 100 that came with the SIP request.

Claim 32:

Applicant's amendment necessitated a new ground of rejection presented in this office action. As such any further response to Applicant's argument is moot.

Claims 11-14, 16, 17 and 20-23:

Applicant's amendment necessitated a new ground of rejection presented in this office action. As such any further response to Applicant's argument is moot.

***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SALMAN AHMED whose telephone number is (571)272-8307. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571) 272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. A./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2419

/Edan Orgad/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619